DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 243 359 HE 017 165

AUTHOR Oliver, Ronald L.
TITLE Evaluating University Teaching: Instructions for Departmental Chairs.
PUB DATE [84]
NOTE 42p.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Guides; College Faculty; *College Instruction; *Department Heads; Evaluation Criteria; *Faculty Evaluation; Guidelines; Higher Education; Individual Characteristics; *Norm Referenced Tests; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

Approaches to faculty evaluation to assist departmental chairs who have no formal background in personnel administration are discussed. Stages in the development and maintenance of performance appraisals for instructors are considered, including a written position guide, a performance planning conference, a performance appraisal procedure, a progress review conference, an individual development program, and a post-development program review conference. Student evaluations of teacher performance are also covered in depth, based on research at Northwestern Oklahoma State University, where students identified characteristics of effective and ineffective university instructors. The process of norm referencing, including an explanation of the normal curve, is discussed in order to illustrate the use of a student evaluation instrument. The norm-referenced instrument that was used at the university is examined in detail. Twenty items by which students evaluate faculty members are identified, and examples of competencies for each item are provided. Additionally, the following aspects of evaluating faculty members with the norm-referenced approach are addressed: individual teacher characteristics, instructional characteristics of the teacher, and the university community activities of the teacher. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED243359

Evaluating University Teaching:

Instructions for Departmental Chairs

Ronald L. Oliver

Northwestern Oklahoma State University

Department of Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ronald L. Oliver

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

NE 017 165

Running Head: EVALUATING UNIVERSITY TEACHING

Abstract

The evaluation process is designed to assist personnel achieve individual a· well as organizational goals. At the university le·el this process includes student evaluations in addition to appraisal by departmental chairs. The purpose of this report is to clarify this process for departmental chairs who have had no formal training in personnel administration. A plan is revealed to assist departmental chairs develop and maintain performance appraisals for instructors. There is a discussion of the part student evaluations play in the overall appraisal process. Individual characteristics, institutional characteristics, and university community activities are refined through norm-referencing and a listing of instructor's strengths and weaknesses.

Evaluating University Teaching:

Instructions for Departmental Chairs

The evaluation process is designed to assist personnel achieve individual as well as organizational goals. At the university level this process includes student evaluations in addition to appraisal by departmental chairs. The purpose of this report is to clarify the process.

Except in the Department of Education most departmental chairs have had no formal training in personnel administration. Each distinct part of this report composes phases regarding the evaluation of university teaching with specific emphasis on how to evaluate in addition to what to evaluate. The report is geared to assist departmental chairs who have had no formal training in personnel evaluation and/or personnel administration.

Performance Appraisal

The departmental chair will need a plan to develop and maintain performance appraisals for personnel. One of the best known plans for personnel evaluations was cultivated by Castetter (1976). Six distinct stages are listed regarding the appraisal system. Stages include: (1) position guide; (2) performance planning conference procedure; (3) performance appraisal procedure; (4) progress review conference procedure; (5) individual development program; and (6) post development program review conference.

Instructors should receive a written position guide before the start of the fall semester; receive planning conference procedures, performance appraisal procedures, and progress review conference procedures in writing before the start of the fall semester; university development programs should be in writing and available to instructors; and a post development program review conference should be held during the last two or three weeks of the spring semester. The departmental chair should should meet with all instructors during the first week of the fall semester to clarify the performance appraisal process.

During the initial appraisal clarification meeting the departmental chair should have all information in writing available to instructors. The primary purpose of performance appraisal is improvement of instruction rather than retrenchment. Instructors should be notified of the importance of student evaluations and departmental chair appraisal. If 75% of the total evaluation results is dependent upon student evaluations instructors should know this at the beginning of the school term. Conversely, if 6% of the total evaluation results depend on research instructors should be made aware of this requirement. There should be periodic individual meetings with all instructors during the school year. The purpose of these meetings is to clarify the progress of performance. At all times due process must be prevalent.

Student Convictions Regarding Effective Instruction

One of the course requirements for ED 3032, Northwestern Oklahoma State University, taught by this instructor, is to analyze effective instruction at the public school and university levels through evaluation. Four classes particpated in a questionnaire regarding effective instruction. The class members were second semester secondary education majors. All class members participated in the project. Numbers of these four classes: (1) Fall, 1982 - 14, (2) Spring, 1983 - 20, (3) Fall, 1983 - 17, and (4) Spring, 1984 - 14. Results regarding effective university teaching are reported in numerical order of responses. Tabulations regarding student perceptions of effective and ineffective university teaching were calculated in response to the following questionnaire items relating to university instruction: (1) identify five characteristics of an effective university instructor, and (2) identify five characteristics of an ineffective university instructor. Each of the grouped characteristics reported received a minimum of twenty student selections. The total number of responses per characteristic is signified by N.

Characteristics of Effective Instructors (University)	N
1. high expectation of students	37
2. well-prepared	34
3. valid and reliable grading system	30
4. previous public school experience	28
5. listens to students	24
6. Ph.D. or Ed.D.	22
7. great subject matter knowledge	21

Characteristics of Ineffective Instructors (University)	N
1. high grade distribution with no student effort	32
2. not prepared	30
3. antiquated course material	29
4. boring	29
5. does not see class from student point of view	29
6. talks above students	27
7. not in office during posted hours	26
8. cannot communicate with students individually	24
9. does not attend university events	21

Norm-Referencing

A normal curve is a smooth, bell-shaped frequency of scores, symmetrical about the mean (mathematical average) and described by an exact statistical equation (Aiken, 1982). The test scores or quantitative markings of a group are frequently distributed in an approximately normal curve. Thus, norm-referencing applies to a list of scores obtained by comparing scores of examinees to scores of other examinees. Scores are not compared to a predetermined content or criterion. In any norm-referenced system there is not a pass or fail. Some examinees will be at the top of the distribution and some at the bottom of the distribution regarding scores.

Normal Curve

The following normal curve includes percentages between standard deviations (measures of dispersion):

%	2.5	13.5	15	19	19	15	13.5	2.5
SD	-2.0	-1.0	-.5	0	+.5	+1.0	+2.0	

Normal Curve (explanation)

Regardless of the number of people being evaluated or taking a test, 19% of the total will have a score between the mean (0) and .5 standard deviations (SD) above the mean. Approximately 34% (19 + 15) of the total number of people being evaluated (for purposes of this paper) will have evaluations between the mean (0) and one (+1.0) standard deviations (SD) below the mean.

Normal Curve and the Student Evaluation Instrument

Students will mark instructors from a low of 1 to a high of 7 on the student evaluation instrument regarding the effectiveness of a particular instructor. By utilizing statistical techniques, a computer will enumerate the effectiveness of a particular instructor in comparison to the effectiveness of all other instructors being evaluated. Each individual instructor will be able to ascertain how he/she ranks in comparison to all other instructors.

Normal Curve and Immediate Supervisor Evaluation

(norm-referenced)

Immediate supervisors will mark instructors from a low of 1 to a high of 7 on the evaluation form regarding techniques being evaluated through norm-referencing. The following guideline approximates the normal curve regarding this evaluation.

Below -2.0 Standard Deviations	0 points
Between -2.0 and -1.0 SD	1 point
Between -1.0 and - .5 SD	2 points
Between - .5 and 0.0 (mean)	3 points
Between 0.0 and + .5 (SD)	4 points
Between + .5 and +1.0 (SD)	5 points
Between +1.0 and +2.0 (SD)	6 points
Over +2.0	7 points

Using this system there will be times when no instructor receives a score of 0, 1, or 7. However, this system makes a simple summary of how each individual instructor compares to the other instructors. Naturally, more than one instructor will receive the same number of points in a given category using this system.

Normal Curve and Immediate Supervisor Evaluation

(strengths and weaknesses)

The normal curve is not appropriate for immediate supervisor evaluations regarding the strengths and weaknesses of each individual instructor.

Student Evaluation Instrument (norm-referenced)

A competent instructor will appreciate comments made by students regarding the course. The instructor can take these comments to continue strengths and improve weaknesses. Norm-referenced student evaluations compare an individual instructor with all other instructors in the norm group.

Northwestern Oklahoma State University uses a ten point norm-referenced student evaluation instrument. For purposes of this report the N.W.O.S.U. instrument has been expanded to twenty points.

Standardized tests require exact administration and scoring procedures. The departmental chair should arrange for an outside, non-interested, person (non-faculty) to supervise student evaluations of the instructor. Written administrative procedures should be read to each individual class.

Students should mark instructors from a low of 1 to a high of 7 on the student evaluation instrument regarding the effectiveness of a particular instructor. Instructors should be given a copy of the student evaluation instrument during the initial performance appraisal conference.

The final overall evaluation marking (#20) should be used for evaluation purposes. Strengths and weaknesses can be noted through a critical analysis of each of the instrument variables.

Student evaluations should be collected for each course each semester including undergraduate students, graduate students, day classes, night classes, summer classes, and extension classes. Results of student evaluations should be given to instructors as soon as possible. Since student evaluations should be recorded during the last one or two weeks of the course the results should be made available to instructors no later than three weeks into the next semester.

Student Evaluation Instrument (comments)

There should be space, at the conclusion of the norm-referencing, for students to make comments regarding the instructor. The N.W.O.S.U. comment section of nine variables has been expanded to fifteen variables for purposes of this report. Student comments should be typed and copies given to each individual instructor at the same time the norm-referenced results are available. Student comments give students the opportunity to point out strengths and weaknesses of the instructor.

Student Evaluation Instrument (norm-referenced)

1. Subject matter knowledge of the instructor
2. Logical and orderly presentation of ideas by the instructor
3. Written communication from the instructor to students
4. Oral communication from the instructor to students
5. Identification by the instructor with general objectives, behavioral objectives, and student competencies of the course
6. Clarification by the instructor of student responsibilities
7. Class preparation of the instructor
8. Evaluation procedures used by the instructor
9. Relevancy of course requirements required by the instructor
10. Amount of learning achieved by students due to the teaching methods of the instructor
11. Extent to which the instructor was enthusiastic
12. Attempt by the instructor to make the course interesting
13. Receptivity of the instructor to student ideas
14. Possibility of student participation in class sessions
15. Personal example set by the instructor for students
16. Instructor's course presentations
17. Personal interest of the instructor in each student's work
18. Rapport of instructor with students
19. Chances of student recommendation to other students
20. Overall evaluation

Student Evaluation Instrument (evaluation techniques)

1. ability to answer student questions, presentation of material, professional training, and use of notes
2. written outline is used by the instructor, ideas are reasonable, and class sessions are organized
3. written course syllabus available to students, course expectations in writing, and written grading scale
4. instructor's use of English, ability to answer questions, and no personal distracting habits
5. objectives are in writing, objectives are quantifiable, and objectives are relevant
6. student responsibilities are in writing, distributed the first possible class period, and justifiable
7. each class session has objectives, written handouts, and instructor anticipates student questions
8. evaluation procedures are in writing, maximum emphasis is put on examination results, and students are expected to do outside reading and assignments
9. expectations are at the correct level (undergraduate/graduate), course expectations are in line with departmental competencies, and student responsibilities are relevant
10. learning due to instructional techniques of the instructor, outside readings, and class discussions

Student Evaluation Instrument (evaluation techniques)

11. instructor showed spirit, eagerness, and optimism during each course meeting
12. material was not diluted to make the course interesting, students were challenged, and no extensive use of the lecture method of teaching
13. students were given the chance to have input into the course, student ideas were interjected into course requirements, and the instructor welcomed student input
14. maximum emphasis was placed on group discussion, question-answer sessions, and student leadership within the class when appropriate
15. instructor was a leader, role model, and commanded personal and professional respect from students
16. presentations were varied with use of the lecture method, behavior modification, discovery, group discussion, demonstration, and individualized instruction observable
17. individual with each student after essay examinations, regularly invited each student to participate in class, and respect for each student
18. understanding, empathy, and understanding of student concerns by the instructor
19. chance of other students benefiting by taking the course, being exposed to the instructor, and offered the opportunity to learn through effective instructional techniques by the instructor
20. overall evaluation based on the student evaluation instrument

Student Evaluation Instrument (comments)

1. subject matter knowledge of the instructor
2. presentation of ideas by the instructor
3. communication of instructor to students
4. receptivity of instructor to student ideas
5. personal interest of the instructor in each student's work
6. rapport of instructor with students
7. general comments regarding the course
8. objectives of the course
9. clarification by the instructor of student responsibilities
10. evaluation procedures used by the instructor
11. comments regarding course examinations
12. comments regarding course outside assignments
13. work load
14. textbook
15. other comments

Individual Characteristics (strengths and weaknesses)

Individual characteristics of each instructor should be evaluated by both students and the departmental chair. Students can evaluate the individual characteristics of each instructor on the student evaluation instrument. Departmental chairs should evaluate each instructor regarding individual characteristics on the university form. Strengths and weaknesses are written rather than norm-referenced for maximum results. In this manner the instructor will know exactly how the departmental chair views his/her individual characteristics.

Each of the following individual characteristics received a minimum of ten student evaluation choices when ED 3032 students were asked to identify five characteristics of an effective college instructor. Students and departmental chairs should be given the chance to itemize strengths and weaknesses for each instructor correlating to individual characteristics.

Individual Characteristics (strengths and weaknesses)

1. admired (by students and faculty)
2. alert (prepared)
3. appearance (personal and professional)
4. approachable (for students and faculty)
5. available
6. cheerful
7. consistent
8. cooperative (to students and faculty)
9. courteous
10. dependable
11. emotional stability
12. enthusiastic
13. fairminded
14. firm (solid)
15. grooming
16. initiative
17. interesting
18. optomistic
19. personal habits
20. poise (composure)

Individual Characteristics (strengths and weaknesses)

21. receptive

22. realistic

23. responsible

24. sense of humor

25. sociable

26. speech

27. tolerant (forgiving)

28. warm

Individual Characteristics (strengths and weaknesses)

(evaluation techniques)

The immediate supervisor will evaluate the instructor's individual characteristics based on daily observation, observation over the term of the semester, student comments, faculty comments, non-faculty comments, and community reflections. Strengths will be noted and weaknesses corrected.

Students may comment on the instructor's individual characteristics on the student evaluation form.

Instructional Characteristics

The instructional characteristics of the instructor can be measured by the departmental chair through norm-referencing and a listing of strengths and weaknesses. Departmental chairs should mark instructors on a scale ranging from 1 (low) to 7 (high) on the norm-referencing part of the evaluation. A competent immediate supervisor will have little trouble rank-ordering instructors on instructional characteristics based on material submitted by the instructor. The section of this report entitled Normal Curve and Immediate Supervisor Evaluation (norm-referenced) clarifies the marking system.

Departmental chairs should mark instructor's strengths and weaknesses regarding instructional characteristics. The strengths and weaknesses should be listed separate from the norm-referenced section of instructional characteristics.

Faculty evaluation forms available to division directors at Northwestern Oklahoma State University have been expanded for this report.

Instructional Characteristics (norm-referenced)

1. Current Course Syllabus and Student Expectations
   a. written course syllabus
   b. syllabus includes course description, general course objectives, and student competencies
   c. syllabus includes material covered in class
   d. syllabus includes name and price of required text
   e. syllabus includes master schedule of exact examination dates, outside assignment due dates, and daily/weekly schedule requirements
   f. syllabus includes all student expectations
   g. syllabus includes grading system
   h. syllabus includes name of instructor and office hours including location and phone number of the instructor and departmental offices
   i. each student is given a copy of the syllabus

Instructional Characteristics (norm-referenced)

2. Justifiable and Consistent Grading System

   a. grading system is in writing

   b. students are given a copy of grading system

   c. written evaluation methods and expectations regarding course examinations including the number and kinds (multiple choice, matching, essay, etc.) of test items

   d. students are informed if examinations are norm-referenced or criterion-referenced

   e. percent of total class grade due to examination results is valid

   f. grading system is reliable due to maximum number of student class requirements

   g. student expectations are in writing regarding outside requirements (library work, papers, research articles, etc.)

   h. percent of overall grade due to class attendance, participation, and effort (if applicable) is in writing

Instructional Characteristics (norm-referenced)

3. Makes Effective Use of Facilities, Equipment, Materials, and Resources

   a. proper utilization of school facilities (lights are turned-off after class, room temperature is kept within university guidelines, furniture is appropriate for university students (desk size), etc.)

   b. school procedures are followed regarding checking-out audio-visual equipment, checking-in audio-visual equipment, and university equipment in general

   c. current stock of supplies including paper, pencils, staplers, scissors, chalk, laboratory supplies, teaching supplies (reeds for clarinets, wood for industrial arts, first-aid materials, etc.)

   d. student and faculty utilization of the library, community resource personnel, and university resources

Instructional Characteristics (norm-referenced)

4. Valid and Reliable Lesson Plans

   a. lesson plans are in writing

   b. lesson plans include preparation for the entire course and daily/weekly classes

   c. lesson plans include daily objectives correlating to general objectives

   d. lesson plans include textbook requirements

   e. lesson plans include non-textbook requirements

   f. lesson plans include specific activities for each class period

   g. lesson plans include student assignments

Instructional Characteristics (norm-referenced)

(evaluation techniques)

1. Current Course Syllabus and Student Expectations
   a. instructor submits course syllabus
   b. subjective evaluation by the immediate supervisor
   c. amount of detail
   d. extent of detail
   e. subjective evaluation by the immediate supervisor
   f. subjective evaluation by the immediate supervisor
   g. validity and reliability of grading system
   h. extent of detail
   i. yes or no
2. Justifiable and Consistent Grading System
   a. extent of detail
   b. yes or no
   c. subjective evaluation by the immediate supervisor
   d. yes or no
   e. valid or not valid
   f. reliable or not reliable
   g. extent of detail
   h. extent of detail

Institutional Characteristics (norm-referenced)

(evaluative techniques)

3. Makes Effective Use of Facilities, Equipment, Materials, and Resources

   a. subjective evaluation by the immediate supervisor

   b. subjective evaluation by the immediate supervisor

   c. subjective evaluation by the immediate supervisor

   d. subjective evaluation by the immediate supervisor

4. Valid and Reliable Lesson Plans

   a. yes or no

   b. depth

   c. depth

   d. yes or no

   e. yes or no

   f. subjective evaluation by the immediate supervisor

   g. subjective evaluation by the immediate supervisor

Instructional Characteristics (strengths and weaknesses)

1. preparation and filing of reports
   (departmental and university-wide reports are accurate and turned-in before the due date)
2. maintains appropriate records and files
   (student records, memos from immediate supervisor, bulletins from university administrative personnel, etc.)
3. has expectations of students appropriate for the level of the course
   (undergraduate/graduate level perspective)
4. effectively provides for classes when absent
   (classes meet when instructor must be absent and a professional replacement is available for instructional purposes)
5. utilization of student evaluations
   (strengths are noted and weaknesses corrected)
6. classroom leader
   (instructor takes personal responsibility for the class)

Instructional Characteristics (strengths and weaknesses)

7. has knowledge of and utilizes different methods of teaching
   (lecture, behavior modification, discovery, demonstration, student contracts, group discussion, and individualized instruction)
8. employs characteristics of an effective classroom climate
   (materials are in line with current levels of information, adequate provisions are made for individual differences among students, and activities contribute to the overall goals of the university)
9. respect for multicultural education
   (N.C.A.T.E. requirement)
10. keeps accurate, legible records and handles daily routines satisfactorily
    (written record of student absences, make-up work, and consistency of teaching)
11. observes school policies and regulations
    (faculty personnel policies, instructional and academic policies, and student rules and regulations)

Instructional Characteristics (strengths and weaknesses)

12. makes suggestions for curriculum improvement
    (general education requirements, departmental concerns, and course suggestions)
13. exhibits professional ethics
    (ethics regarding pupil and university personnel)
14. relationship with non-instructional staff
    (secretaries, custodians, cafeteria workers, etc.)
15. self-development program is in writing
    (classroom management techniques, evaluation methods, interpersonal relationships, content competency, instructional methodology, and interpersonal communication)

Instructional Characteristics (strengths and weaknesses)

(evaluative techniques)

1. subjective evaluation by the immediate supervisor
2. instructor submits filing system
3. subjective evaluation by the immediate supervisor
4. yes or no
5. instructor submits notes of strengths and method of correcting weaknesses
6. subjective evaluation by the immediate supervisor
7. evaluation of lesson plans by the immediate supervisor
8. evaluation of lesson plans by the immediate supervisor
9. yes or no
10. evaluation of grade book and records by the immediate supervisor
11. subjective evaluation by the immediate supervisor
12. subjective evaluation by the immediate supervisor
13. subjective evaluation by the immediate supervisor
14. subjective evaluation by the immediate supervisor
15. depth

University Community Activities

The university community activities of the instructor can be measured by the departmental chair through norm-referencing and a listing of strengths and weaknesses. Departmental chairs should mark instructors on a scale ranging from 1 (low) to 7 (high) on the norm-referencing part of the evaluation. Departmental chairs should have few problems rank ordering instructors on university community activities based on material submitted by instructors. The section of this paper entitled Normal Curve and Departmental Chair Evaluation (norm-referenced) clarifies the marking system.

Departmental chairs should mark instructor's strengths and weaknesses regarding university community activities. The strengths and weaknesses should be listed separate from the norm-referenced section of instructional characteristics.

Faculty evaluation forms available to division directors at Northwestern Oklahoma State University have been expanded for purposes of this report.

University Community Activities (norm-referenced)

1. Contributes to University Endeavors
   a. works on institutional projects
   b. helps with departmental projects
   c. originates research studies
   d. presents reports
   e. active involvement in grant applications
   f. assists in campus recruitment
   g. advises undergraduate/graduates
2. Observed in Study and Research Activities
   a. composition of original articles
   b. involvement in action research
   c. presents original papers at national, state, and university functions
   d. initiates research articles
   e. inaugurates reports
   f. authors books
   g. reviews books

University Community Activities (norm-referenced)

3. Attends Professional Meetings and Seminars
   a. national
   b. state
   c. community
   d. university
   e. departmental
4. Attends and Supports University Sponsored Events
   a. student athletic events
   b. student non-athletic events
   c. faculty affairs

University Community Activities (norm-referenced)

(evaluation techniques)

1. Contributes to University Endeavors
   a. instructor submits number of institutional projects
   b. instructor submits number of departmental projects
   c. instructor submits information regarding research originated for the university
   d. instructor submits number of reports
   e. instructor submits number of grant applications
   f. instructor submits method of campus recruiting
   g. instructor submits number and method of working with undergraduate/graduate students
2. Observed in Study and Research Activities
   a. instructor submits original research articles
   b. instructor submits action research projects
   c. instructor submits number of papers presented at national, state, and university functions
   d. instructor submits work being done on research
   e. instructor submits reports
   f. instructor submits book(s)
   g. instructor submits book review(s)

University Community Activities (norm-referenced)

(evaluation techniques)

3. Attends Professional Meetings and Seminars
   a. instructor submits number of national meetings and seminars attended
   b. instructor submits number of state meetings and seminars attended
   c. instructor submits number of community meetings and seminars attended
   d. instructor submits number of university meetings and seminars attended
   e. instructor submits number of departmental meetings and seminars attended
4. Attends and Supports University Sponsored Events
   a. instructor submits number of student athletic events attended and supported
   b. instructor submits number of student non-athletic events attended and supported
   c. instructor submits number of faculty affairs attended and supported

University Community Activities (strengths and weaknesses)

1. effective member of those committees to which assigned (faculty senate, teacher education committee, academic affairs committee, student affairs committee, etc.)
2. service to the community (business community and public and private schools)
3. relationship with co-workers (exchanges helpful ideas, methods, and materials)

University Community Activities (strengths and weaknesses)

(evaluation techniques)

1. instructor submits work accomplished on assigned committees
2. instructor submits written record of exact service to the community
3. instructor submits written outline of how he/she cooperated with co-workers and evaluation by the immediate supervisor based on comments made by co-workers

Summary

Evaluating university teaching is a process designed to assist instructors achieve individual as well as organizational goals. Student evaluations and departmental chair evaluations validate the assessment. Only when the goals of the university and the objectives of each unit are established, and the personnel process integrated, does there become the possibility of achieving the results intended by the master plan for development. Self-development is critical to the performance of each university instructor.

References

Aiken, L. R. (1982). Psychological testing and assessment. Boston, MASS: Allyn, and Bacon, Inc., 403.

Castetter, W. B. (1976). The personnel function in educational administration. New York, NY: MacMillan Publishing Co., 249.